



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/623,619

07/22/2003

Mahesh Balu Mistry

15772.0006

5053

23517 7590 01/12/2007
BINGHAM MCCUTCHEN LLP
3000 K STREET, NW
BOX IP
WASHINGTON, DC 20007

EXAMINER

TRAN, HANH VAN

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3637

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
--	-----------	---------------

3 MONTHS

01/12/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/623,619

Applicant(s)

MISTRY ET AL.

Examiner

Hanh V. Tran

Art Unit

3637

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 October 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 4-14, 16 and 18-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 4-11, 14, 16, 18-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 12 and 13 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This is the Final Office Action from the examiner in charge of this application in response to applicant's amendment dated 10/17/2006.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 14, 16, and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by USP 6,179,144 to Abroy et al.

Abroy et al discloses a cabinet comprising all the elements recited in the above listed claims including a back portion 24 fixedly connectable to a wall, a cover portion 36 cooperating with the back portion 24 to form an interior space and being detachably connected to the back portion, a hinge structure 48 having a first component connected to one of the back portion 24 and the cover portion 36 and a second, complementary component connected to the other of the back portion 24 and the cover portion 36; a vent formed in the cover portion 36, said vent being defined as the gap formed by member 60 of the cover portion 36 and the back portion, such as shown in Fig 4, a water diverting plate 96 disposed below the vent and on the back portion; wherein the hinge structure includes a pair of mounting brackets formed on opposite sides of the back portion, and pivot pin engaging each of the mounting brackets, the vent comprises a gap formed between the cover portion and the wall.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

6. Claims 1, 4-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abroy et al in view of USP 4,223,965 to Palandrani.

Abroy et al discloses a cabinet comprising all the elements recited in the above listed claims including a back portion 24 fixedly connectable to a wall, a cover portion 36 cooperating with the back portion 24 to form an interior space and being detachably connected to the back portion, a hinge structure 48 having a first component connected to one of the back portion 24 and the cover portion 36 and a second, complementary component connected to the other of the back portion 24 and the cover portion 36; a vent formed in the cover portion 36, said vent being defined as the gap formed by member 60 of the cover portion 36 and the back portion, such as shown in Fig 4, a water diverting plate 96 disposed below the vent and on the back portion; wherein the

Art Unit: 3637

hinge structure includes a pair of mounting brackets formed on opposite sides of the back portion, and pivot pin engaging each of the mounting brackets, the vent comprises a gap formed between the cover portion and the wall. The different being that Abroy et al does not clearly disclose spacer means comprising a plurality of protrusions extending outwardly from a rear surface of the back portion.

Palandrani discloses a wall mounted cabinet comprising spacer means comprising a plurality of protrusions 19 extending outwardly from a rear surface of the back portion, such as shown in Figs 2-3, in order to facilitate mounting the cabinet to a wall, at the same time preventing water from seeping along the wall into the interior of the cabinet. Therefore, it would have been obvious to modify the structure of Abroy et al by providing spacer means comprising a plurality of protrusions extending outwardly from a rear surface of the back portion in order to facilitate mounting the cabinet to a wall, at the same time preventing water from seeping along the wall into the interior of the cabinet, as taught by Palandrani, since both teach alternate conventional wall mounted cabinet structure, used for the same intended purpose, thereby providing structure as claimed.

7. Claims 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abroy et al in view of Palandrani.

Abroy et al discloses all the elements as discussed above except for spacer means comprising a plurality of protrusions extending outwardly from a rear surface of the back portion.

Palandrani discloses a wall mounted cabinet comprising spacer means comprising a plurality of protrusions 19 extending outwardly from a rear surface of the back portion, such as shown in Figs 2-3, in order to facilitate mounting the cabinet to a wall, at the same time preventing water from seeping along the wall into the interior of the cabinet. Therefore, it would have been obvious to modify the structure of Abroy et al by providing spacer means comprising a plurality of protrusions extending outwardly from a rear surface of the back portion in order to facilitate mounting the cabinet to a wall, at the same time preventing water from seeping along the wall into the interior of the cabinet, as taught by Palandrani, since both teach alternate conventional wall mounted cabinet structure, used for the same intended purpose, thereby providing structure as claimed.

Allowable Subject Matter

8. Claims 12-13 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments filed 10/17/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In response to applicant's argument on pages 7 and 8 that Abroy fails to teach (i) a cover portion detachably connected to a back portion, the examiner takes the position that Abroy teaches a cover portion 36, and this cover portion 36 is detachably connected to the back portion via a hinge structure 48; (ii) a hinge structure including mounting brackets and pivot pins, the examiner takes the position that the hinge

Art Unit: 3637

structure of Abroy, as shown in the drawing figures does show mounting bracket and pivot pins in order to allow movement of the cover portion 36 between the open and closed positions; (iii) a vent comprising a gap formed between a cover portion and a wall, the examiner takes the position that Abroy clearly discloses, such as shown in Fig 4, a vent comprising a gap formed between the cover portion 36 and a wall; (iv) a water-diverting plate below the vent, the examiner takes the position that Abroy clearly discloses, such as shown in Fig 4, a water-diverting plate 96 below the vent.

10. In response to applicant's argument on page 8 that Abroy teaches a hinged cover that is not detachable, the examiner takes the position that the hinged cover 36 of Abroy is detachable once the pivot pins of the hinge structure 48 are removed, thus allowing the cover 36 to be detached from the back portion.

11. In response to applicant's argument on page 8 that Abroy is "completely silenced with regard to a gap formed by the present invention", the examiner takes the position that the claimed language fails to provide adequate structural limitations in describing the members in order to distinguish from Abroy, and as stated in the above claimed rejection, Abroy teaches all the limitations of a vent as recited in the rejected claims.

Conclusion

12. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 3637

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hanh V. Tran whose telephone number is (571) 272-6868. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, and alternate Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lanna Mai can be reached on (571) 272-6867. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3637

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

HVT *HVT*
January 05, 2007

LANNA MAI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600

Lanna Mai